

Mrs. Henson vs. Woman Suffrage

By LUCY CARY

In her article of June 18, Mrs. Henson likens herself to the brave Dutch boy, who saved the lowlands of Holland from inundation by keeping his hand in a break in the dike until help came, but a more apt illustration would be that of a little girl stationing herself on the seashore and attempting to sweep back the rush of the incoming tide with a small broom. It is a pretty safe prediction that, even though she succeeds in calling her most cultured "women" (evidently the suffragists do not rank in that class) to her aid, the combined sweep of all their brooms, both large and small, will not succeed in staying the great tide of new and expanded thought which is surging over the world, and of which the effort of women to obtain political freedom is but one evidence.

Before undertaking to stamp out the suffrage movement in Virginia, Mrs. Henson should inform herself more accurately on the subject which she attempts to handle. Among the errors contained in her article of June 18, the following are perhaps the most striking:

She states that there are four equal suffrage States. There are five. She omits Washington, where the women have done well with the ballot and justified the wisdom of conferring it upon them.

She also states that in California woman suffrage was defeated by popular vote. As it has never been put to the popular vote, this statement is palpably erroneous. The fact is, that an equal suffrage bill has recently been passed in the California Legislature, but does not go to the people for ratification or rejection until October, when the suffragists of California have good hope of its adoption. She neglects to mention that the Wisconsin Legislature has very lately passed a woman suffrage bill, which must go to the voters in the near future.

Mrs. Henson says: "The suffrage cause has been defeated in ten years 132 times," but she fails to note the significance of the fact that, in spite of repeated defeats, the movement surely, steadily and irresistibly grows. As a fair example of its progress, notice what has happened in Connecticut. Two years ago an equal suffrage bill introduced in the Legislature of that State received only two votes. In June, 1911, a similar bill received forty-nine votes. At this rate, the suffragists of Connecticut will soon turn defeat into victory.

Mrs. Henson tells us an anecdote about "Mary Johnson, Mary Still, Mary Yet," whose depravity, and that of her sister voters, in selling votes caused the men of New Jersey to withdraw the ballot from their women in 1776. She further says that the better class of women did not vote. Of course, they did not vote. Does she seriously intend to compare the women of 1776 with the women of today? Times have changed since then, and women have been forced to change with them. Let the educated working women of these United States bear witness to that fact. In this connection, it may not be amiss to say that some of our male voters appear to be as depraved in the matter of selling votes as was the lady of 1776—perhaps because of the pernicious example set by those same women voters of by-gone years.

The men of Norfolk county, however, have not yet been deprived of the ballot, though, from what has been

published concerning some of the fraudulent elections held there, it is evident that Mary Johnson-Still-Yet will not lack for male society in that place where she has leisure to repent of her misdeeds.

It has been well said that every reform has three stages—ridicule, opposition, adoption. Measured by this rule, the equal suffrage movement in Virginia has made healthy and normal progress. Mrs. Henson herself bears this statement out, for she says that she laughed at the movement as being the impending ruin, she is calling for help to sweep back the threatened inundation; she says that help will shortly come in the form of organized opposition. If she is a true prophet, we are about to enter upon our second stage. So be it! Let us enter and pass through this stage as quickly as may be, and the third will come in adoption. At a conservative estimate, adoption will come within twenty-five years.

"The thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns. And I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs."

The widening process is slow, sure and inevitable, full of beauty, majesty and hope, but also fraught with anxiety, pain and strife. Our little efforts cannot stay it for long, nor yet greatly hasten its majestic march, but let us be sure that we are throwing our influence on the right side, lest haply we be found to fight against the eternal principles of truth and justice.

You Can Love Truly and Often if You Have the Chance

BY ADA PATTERSON.

A former Postmaster-General of the United States, former postmaster of New York City and president of a National Bank has lifted up his voice to explode an aged theory. General Thomas L. James, of many years and honors, said on the occasion of his fourth wedding, that the theory that we can truly love but once in a lifetime, is "nonsense."

Well, isn't it? Don't speak before thinking, but think before speaking. Isn't it true? Draw on your personal experience, not on the maxims of an old-fashioned novel. Persons who read the Fannie Burney and Jane Austen style of novels believe we love but once. But they also regret the tallow candle and sigh for our great-grandmother's days, when every house had its spinning wheel, and every woman spun her own frocks. These are the persons who faint at mention of a co-operative kitchen and think any invention for washing dishes by machinery is a sin.

Read the general's argument and consider it before you try to answer it. He says love differs in kind, but not in degree.

"We care for people for what they are, and as no two people are exactly alike, we do not feel in exactly the same way toward any two people. You cannot really compare affection. One might care for half a dozen persons, one as much as the other."

The general, a good American citizen and officer holder, did not speak in a Turkish sense, nor yet in the spirit of a progressive divorcee. He makes no pretensions claim that a man can love two women truly at the same time.

He said: "I have never been divorced. My three former wives died." The general had, then, a clear title for his successive loves. Granted a clear conscience and a happy experience in previous loves, it is natural and to be expected that a man should love and love again, and that a woman have the same right and the same inclination.

We can all remember, if we have lived in small communities, where the interest in personal affairs is always acute, that there was always in the remarriage of a widow or a widower, some suggestion to the curious look-

ers-on of disloyalty to the one who had gone before.

In this less sentimental and more charitable period, we regard a second marriage, if not too speedily contracted, as a certificate of good character to the deceased spouse.

We know that with the taste for weepy novels has passed the expectation of continuous weep wearing. The twentieth century is one in which wholesome common sense has succeeded sentiment. A bride gave evidence of this in her farewells to one of her guests, an intimate friend, who helped her to slip out of the clinging white satin of her wedding into the gray cloth of her going-away gown. She had married a widower, and she was talking of their future home.

"Frank thought I might like to have a new home. He offered to build a house farther up town. But I told him the old one was more convenient to his business, and he was used to it and I didn't mind. Would you?"

Would any woman who had a head set squarely on her shoulders and a heart in her bosom? Don't discount the heart in a matter of understanding. It is a great aid in difficult situations and a skillful interpreter of difficult persons.

I saw the bride next at a dinner the pair gave to a few friends when they had returned from their honeymoon wanderings. She led us through the old home. When we stopped in the library, before the fireplace, filled with the summer garniture of fragrant green boughs, we glanced at the portrait of a sweet, womanly face above the mantel. The eyes of the bride followed ours. They rested with a glance as kindly interested upon the picture.

"My husband's first wife," she said, simply, and the tour of the rooms continued. When the other guests had gone, the bride spoke, as she had done after her wedding, of a subject which we both understood she was now discussing for all time from tongue and mind.

"I am here in the house which my husband occupied with his former wife, but I have never had a moment's happiness because of it. He asked me whether I would prefer that her portrait should be packed away, and I

The Always Busy Store



This Dress \$2.98
Made from very fine linen, combination embroidered waist effect. Formerly sold for \$7.50.

RICHMOND'S GREAT UNDERSELLING STORE
THE FREED CO.
311 EAST BROAD STREET

The Always Busy Store

Crowds as Great as Ever Attend Our REBUILDING SALE

The people of Richmond never lose hold of a good proposition. They appreciate values, and they take advantage of money-saving opportunities.

We Reduced Our Prices to Reduce Our Goods

We are offering greater values than any other store in the city—

That's Why We Are Always Crowded

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ILLUSTRATE

Separate Skirts

All colors—All sizes.
\$5.00 Skirts\$2.98
\$6.50 Skirts\$3.98
\$8.00 Skirts\$4.98
\$10.00 Skirts\$5.98
Etc., Etc.
Alterations Free

Linene Suits

Colors white and blue; sailor or notch collar trim; selling value \$4.50; 98c our price

Marquisette Dresses

The kind that one just loves to wear. Made from the imported French Marquisette. Combination lace waist effect. Tucked skirt. Must be seen to be appreciated. Regular price \$12.98; our price

\$5.98

NONE C. O. D.
NONE ON APPROVAL.

Shirt Waists

A lot of over 500 Waists; lawns and lingers; various styles; values up to \$2.50; our price

79c

Summer Dresses

Linens, Lawns, Chambrays, Ginghams, Dimities.
\$3.00 Dresses 98c
\$5.00 Dresses\$1.98
\$6.50 Dresses\$2.98
\$8.00 Dresses\$3.98
Etc., Etc.

ROUNTREE BAGGAGE IS THE BEST FOR ALL TRIPS



IT IS MADE BETTER, LOOKS BETTER AND WILL WITHSTAND THE "KNOCKS OF THE ROAD" BETTER THAN ANY OTHER BAGGAGE. You really will not know the joys of traveling if you don't take a

ROUNTREE QUALITY TRUNK

They are so superior in every respect, so convenient and well made. Your clothes are always safe and the dust cannot possibly reach them. Then, too, the Roller Tray gives you free access to the bottom of the trunk without lifting up the top tray.

Come in and look over our stock. You will find everything a traveler will need.

A ROUNTREE WARDROBE TRUNK

Is just the trunk for the bride. In fact, it is the Trunk for all who wish to travel in real comfort. The Rountree Wardrobe Trunk is as easy to pack as your wardrobe at home. It stands up in your room; your clothes hang on hangers and do not wrinkle, and everything is where you can put your hands on it.

"Factory to You"

H. W. ROUNTREE & BRO.
TRUNK & BAG CO.
703 EAST BROAD STREET.

Count Leo Tolstoy as He Really Was

By BERNARD SHAW.

Tolstoy was a man of genius in the very first flight of that rare species. He had the penetrating common sense characteristic of that first flight. And yet, an old maid of county family, living in a cathedral town on 300 pounds a year, could have made more absurd attempts to start an ideal social system by private misanthropy than he. He put on his dress of moult armor. He tried to ignore

Will Teach in John Marshall High School



MISS LENA REEKS, OF BOYNTON.

(Special to The Times-Dispatch.)
Miss Appomattox, Va., July 8.—Miss Mary Reeks, of Boynton, has resigned her position as assistant principal of the hattie High School, and becomes a teacher in the John Marshall High School, Richmond. Miss Reeks is for the state of the Woman's College, Sta.

legs, of Lynchburg, where she has a host of friends. She has been very successful as a teacher and is very popular socially, both in Richmond and Lynchburg, as well as in Appomattox and Boynton. Miss Reeks became an instructor in mathematics at John Marshall High School for the next session.

money as Don Quixote did. He left his own skilled work to build houses that could hardly be induced to stand, and to make boots that any army contractor would have been ashamed of. He let his property drift to the verge of insolvency and ruin like the latest Irish squire, because he disapproved of property as an institution. And he was neither honest nor respectable in his follies.

He connived at all sorts of invasions. He would not take money on a journey, but he would take a companion who would buy railroad tickets and pay hotel bills behind his back. He would not own property or copyrights; but he would make them over to his wife and children, and live in their country house in Yasnaya and their town house in Moscow very comfortably, only occasionally easing his conscience, by making things as difficult and unpleasant for them as possible. He insisted on celibacy as the first condition of a worthy life; and his wife became sixteen times a mother, and found him an uxorious husband at seventy.

In the ordinary affairs of life, he shirked every uncongenial responsibility whilst availing himself of every luxury he really cared for. And he called at his wife and family for enabling him to do it, treating his wife as ethically inferior because she insisted on saving the family from ruin, until at last she gave him up as lost, and managed for him without saying anything harsher than her Russian formula "Nothing matters so long as the baby is not crying."

Probably many of Tolstoy's admirers dismissed these facts during his lifetime as silly legends invented by people who did not understand him. But it seems clear now that they were quite true. Not, of course, that Tolstoy was fact proof. He soon found out when he was once tired of it, though he did not always cease to recommend others to do it. But one is none the less left asking why he did not forego the inevitable breakdown of his attempts to behave like a disciple of Jerusalem 1200 years ago. I am tempted to answer that he never foresaw anything, and learned what he did learn through the simple process of knocking his head against it.

The reader may here lose patience and say that if I have nothing more sensible to say than that Tolstoy was a fool, I had better drop the subject and leave this essay to more competent hands. Others may say that we all learn things by knocking our heads against them. Others, again, may say that Tolstoy had been through all ordinary reasoning and come out on the other side of it with the knowledge that we can only extend the range of possibility in human conduct, as in other things, by continually attempting the impossible. I have said all these things to myself. But take a single incident from his life. Tolstoy writes the "Kreutzer Sonata." It is suggested that it should be read to the family and their guests at Yasnaya. Tolstoy, assenting, hands the manuscript to a gentleman to read. The gentleman begins confidently; presently grows doubtful; finally tells the countess that he really cannot go on reading in the presence of the young or girls. Tolstoy on being asked whether the book is fit for their ears, replies calmly that they had better go to bed, which they do before reading is resumed.

Now, to say that Tolstoy could not have foreseen this, is to say that he had not intelligence enough to know, that if he went out into the rain without an umbrella, he would get wet. Yet it is clear from the narrative that he did not foresee it, and this must mean that he was so continually preoccupied with his ideas and his imagination that he seldom gave his mind to more immediate practical considerations—including the consideration of other people's feelings and convenience—until his own produced his inevitable consequences.

No wonder the countess was often near the end of her patience! Indeed there is one occasion recorded when Tolstoy's pre-occupation with his own conscience carried him into inhuman callousness of heart and declaring he leaving the house and declaring he could no longer endure to live in such a fashion has been brought into prominence by his death on one of these occasions. He was a man who was boundlessly sympathetic on paper with imagination, but who was so strangely inconsiderate to real people in his own home.

When we go to ask why people stood all this from him, the reply must be partly that the countess did not stand it, but took in her own hands the affairs he neglected, besides giving him pieces of her own mind on occasion. She must be a woman of remarkable strength of character to have borne her burden without breaking down completely. If it be true that the effects of the strain on her had made him in the circumstances of that final flight from Yasnaya which ended in Tolstoy's death, no one can blame her.

So much for that part of the social burden which Tolstoy flung refused to shoulder. After all, we cannot quarrel very deeply with him for his refusal to share his own life with the world, we can hardly complain because he refused to do the ordinary tasks which society offers him, and which are calculated for quite another sort of man. But it must be said that his own peculiarly warped mind have been much better done in some respect if he had managed his estates and administered and exploited his copyrights instead of leaving all this drudgery to his wife.

It ended in his wife knowing a great deal more, in some respects, than he did of men and affairs, and in his using his powers and influence to set men on impracticable and mischievous enterprises. No doubt these had their value, but one does not know whether Tolstoy remained in a condition of invincible ignorance (for he went on giving advice just as if it had worked perfectly) or whether he simply would not take the trouble to change his mind. He was most unfortunately incapable of laughing at himself, though he had a keen sense of the irony of wasted philanthropy—for example whilst he was organizing famine relief he ridiculed the whole business steadily, all through, as a ghastly futility. Yet, when a Tolstoyan colony was making itself a spectacle for gods and men, not by organizing relief for starving people, but by reducing well-fed ones to destitution, his irony was aroused—he persuaded himself, and sometimes even persuaded the colonists, that all that was wrong was that they had not been quite foolish enough.

On the whole, we must conclude that it was a grave and incurable defect in Tolstoy's training that he never been obliged to do a real job of real work, and do it for his living. His spell of soldiering was of no use to him in that way—a man learns nothing of affairs from being cooped up in a battery and fed like a cannon. He knew French and English and is fired at by them,